

Amthoff

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA

SOUTH CAROLINA,

DISUNION,

AND A

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY

CONFEDERACY.

SOUTH CAROLINA, DISUNION, AND A MISSISSIPPI VALLEY CONFEDERACY.

NO. I.—THE ANTECEDENTS OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

The State, judged by its ruling majorities, has not had a single patriotic sensation for the last thirty years. As Gen. Jackson said, in his letter to the Rev. Mr. Crawford, she first sought disunion under the pretext of the tariff; and as he predicted, on the failure of that scheme, she has been ever since diligently seeking it under pretext of the slave question.

When she commenced this enterprise, thirty years ago, her aspect, as compared with that of many other States, was one of penury and decay. She seemed to be laboring under a lethargic paralysis. With no manufacturing or mechanical industry, and but little external trade beyond the mere sale of her exports, she had no means of resuscitation by natural means. With nothing to invite influx of population or capital, both population and trade seemed to have come to a stand-still with an ominous prospect of material diminution of both, whilst most of the other States were progressing with unprecedented rapidity. In this state of things it was easy for her politicians to delude her into the belief that her unprosperous condition could be remedied by the organization of a Southern Confederacy, of which she would be the commercial and political center. Hence the great unanimity with which she attempted her mad experiments at nullification and secession. The deep mortification for the disgraceful defeat of that experiment extinguished every remaining spark of her patriotism. It has never been forgotten or forgiven, but has been brooded over until rancorous hate toward the Union and the nation has been substituted for whatever of patriotism she once felt. Her guiding statesmen have held disunion as their ultimate aim in all political operations. It has been untiringly pursued with demoniac hate and perseverance, and with a statesman-like ability worthy of a better cause. Their policy has been, in aid of abolition disunionists, to agitate unceasingly the slave question, for the purpose of consolidating the South into a sectional party, well knowing the necessary consequence to be the consolidation and sectionalizing of the North, together with ultimate disunion. Abolition disunionists and fire-eating disunionists have, for more than twenty years, been aids to each other in the accomplishment of their mutual designs against the Union.

So early as 1835 they commenced the formal agitation in Congress, under the miserable pretext of the presentation of abolition petitions, and it has been perseveringly kept up ever since. The bulk of the nation, North and South, all the time, honestly endeavoring to keep down the agitation. The South was indulged, at the expense of an onerous foreign war, in the acquisition of Texas, for the purpose of extending the area of slavery over five new States. But this was not done fast enough for South Carolina and her co-conspirators. A convention of Southern States was called to meet at Nashville, under the cry of "Texas or Disunion," but it was indignantly repulsed by the citizens of Nashville and failed. But five years later a Southern convention was actually held in Nashville with the view of promoting disunion. The convention was largely attended by prominent men from Carolina, Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi, but there were only a very few from Tennessee, and not a man from Kentucky. This Convention recommended a Con-

gress of Southern States to redress Southern grievances, the chief of those supposed grievances being, at that time, the refusal of Congress to legislate slavery into the southern half of California against the wishes of its citizens. The legislatures of South Carolina and Mississippi were all that acceded to this recommendation of a Southern Congress. During the discussion in the South Carolina legislature leading members undisguisedly avowed disunion as their object, and even said that so far from having any love for the Union, it was the object of their detestation and abhorrence. Mississippi was guilty of the folly of actually calling a convention to decide upon secession on account of their grievances. The agitators were sorely disappointed, and severely rebuked. The convention decided that there was no need for its call, and expressly repudiated secession as nothing but revolution and rebellion.

In 1850 the South was indulged with the passage of a more efficient fugitive slave law, and all sectional questions were settled by what, it was hoped, would prove a permanent compromise pacification. The Democratic party justly claimed the chief credit in obtaining this compromise, and the nation was so well satisfied therewith that its candidate for the Presidency in 1852 secured the vote of twenty-seven out of thirty-one States. But pacification did not suit the disunion agitators. Under their influence the Missouri Compromise was repealed, with full fore-knowledge that its repeal would cause a more intense excitement on the slavery question than was ever before witnessed; that it would probably destroy the northern wing of the Democratic party; and that it would do the South no good, as it was utterly impracticable to make a Slave State out of Kansas. After the repeal had given the control of the House of Representatives to the Free-Soilers, and Mr. Buchanan had escaped defeat by frauds and accident, instead of doing anything to soothe the excitement, they purposely intensified it by attempting to force through the infamous Lecompton swindle against the known wishes of four-fifths of the voters of Kansas. Failing in that, they actually accomplished the passage of the equally infamous bribery bill, whereby they insolently proclaimed that Kansas had population enough to be admitted as a Slave State, but not half enough to be admitted as a Free State. This discrimination in favor of the slavery propaganda they well knew was a grosser sectional outrage and insult than any, or all the acts of the North combined. The fraud saturation of the Lecompton swindle was so notorious, that a distinguished South Carolina Senator was compelled to admit, in afterward addressing his constituents, "that Southern honor required that the South itself should have kicked the infamy out of Congress." Having thus deprived the Democracy of all foothold in the North, they split it into two fragments, nominate a Southern candidate for the Presidency and proclaim that if he is defeated, or which, under the circumstances, was the same, that if Lincoln was elected the Union should be dissolved. His election should be cause for disunion, when they themselves did the very thing to insure his election, even if the bare utterance of such a threat was not itself sufficient for that purpose. What the North, in cooler moments, may do for the purpose of conciliation we have yet to see, but that it should have ignominiously succumbed under the threat, no intelligent honorable man could have expected; eighteen millions of Americans cannot be bullied. The threat was no doubt worth hundreds of thousands of votes to Lincoln, and that result was what was aimed at in its utterance. No intelligent man can doubt that his election was precisely what the disunion agitators aimed to accomplish, and most ardently desired. The grounds of their split with the Northern Democracy, and abandonment of the Cincinnati platform, upon a practically unessential abstraction, cannot be elevated to the dignity of even a respectable pretext. Disunion was the motive, the real motive. This, their conduct since the election places beyond all cavil or doubt.

Since 1835 South Carolina has been industriously pursuing the policy more recently enunciated by her talented and influential leader, Mr. Rhett, in the following words: "*All true statesmanship in the South consists in forming combinations and shaping events, so as to bring about as speedily as possible*

a dissolution of the present Union, and a Southern Confederacy." Or as still more distinctly portrayed in the language of the distinguished agitator, Mr. Yancey: "Organize committees all over the Cotton States to fire the Southern heart, instruct the Southern mind, give courage to each other, and at the proper moment, by one organized, concerted action precipitate the Cotton States into revolution." In pursuance of this policy South Carolina, through her leaders, became a full participant in the atrocious secret conspiracy of eminent politicians and high officials in most of the Southern States to precipitate the nation into civil war in the event of Fremont's election to the Presidency. The avowed scheme was, without waiting any sanction of the people of the South or any part of them, to precipitate the civil war by a seizure of the government with armed force. This civil war with the North, Gov. Wise confessed, would be accompanied by a "*neighborhood civil war*" with the Union-loving men of the South. To meet the exigencies of the occasion he said they would *arm their slaves*. Whilst Senator Clingman said the Union men would be hushed by the "*swift attention of vigilance committees*." A national civil war and a neighborhood civil war combined, to be carried on with the aid of armed slaves and committees of assassins, was the merciful boon prepared for the nation by these cold-blooded, remorseless conspirators, and from which we were saved only by the accidental running of a third candidate. The worst wickedness imputed, as the supposed design of the worst abolitionists, does not transcend this in infamous atreicity. It is rivaled in cruel wickedness by nothing done or attempted by conspirators since the days of Cataline. Had we not their own avowals for the facts, it would be incredible that sane men, educated men, could have seriously conspired, in a Christian, civilized country, for the perpetration of such an enormous crime. How intense and unappeasable must be their hate of the Union and the nation! That precipitation without consultation with the people is still the desire of leading disunionists, may be inferred from the indiscreet admission recently made before the members of the Georgia legislature by Senator Toombs, that he had no confidence in the people, and feared to trust them with a decision of the question of secession.

With this understanding of the long settled views and feelings of South Carolina, we shall be the better able to appreciate her candor in her statement of alleged grievances by way of justification for her attempted secession. In the next number her Declaration of Independence will be considered.

NO. II.—SOUTH CAROLINA'S DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

The most notable thing about this attempt of South Carolina to break up the Federal Government and dissolve the Union, is that she has not a single complaint, fictitious or real, not one to allege against the structure of the Government, or the manner of its administration. She alleges neither want of power or inclination on the part of the Government to protect and promote her rights and interests. So far as the Government is concerned, the complaint is against not what has been done, but what she fears may hereafter be done, by the prohibition of slavery in the Territories, if the Republicans should hereafter obtain the control of the two houses of Congress. To say nothing of the great improbability of that contingency occurring, if it were actually to occur, such a prohibition would furnish only the flimsiest pretext for so mighty a revolution. Such a prohibition, if it had not to encounter the decision of the Supreme Court, denouncing it as void and unconstitutional, would if legally valid accomplish nothing which the laws of climate and trade have not already irrevocably accomplished, there being no Territory into which slavery could be introduced, by any encouragement, for at least fifty years. Such a prohibition would be no novelty in our Government. It was established contemporaneously with the Government as to all the country north of the Ohio; it was the basis of the Missouri Compromise, made, principally, by Southern votes; it was part of the Texas bill of 1845, passed with the aid of a large majority of Southern votes, and which applied it to the whole or nearly the

whole of the Territory upon which it could now have any practical bearing; and it was applied to the Oregon bill, which received the approval of the Southern President, Polk. Such examples would relieve the prohibition, if actually made, from the imputation of an unmistakable disposition in the North wantonly to oppress the South. The sum of this complaint is, the alleged fear of an improbable occurrence, which, if it were actually to happen, would work no substantial prejudice to South Carolina, or any other Southern State.

The other alleged grievances are, first, the non-*rendition* of fugitive slaves; and second, the election of Lincoln.

The grievance from the loss of fugitives is very small, if any, to South Carolina. She probably has not lost ten in as many years, by their escape into a Free State. There is no known instance of any citizen of hers ever having been obstructed in the reclamation of a fugitive. In the total absence of any plausible grievance of her own, or of any other Cotton State, she has been compelled to try to avail herself of a grievance confined almost exclusively to the border States. We of those border States have not the sensibility to feel an insult when it is offered, nor the sense to appreciate an injury from which we are daily suffering. She, therefore, kindly steps in to vindicate our honor, and resent our injuries. So intense is her disinterested chivalry that she will resent the insult, and right the wrong, even at the expense of all her patriotic feelings, and all her duty of allegiance to a Government under which she has lived in peaceful prosperity for eighty years. Such is her self-sufficiency in judging our suffered insults and injuries, that she deems it wholly superfluous to consult us as to the mode or measure of the redress. Had she condescended to do this, she would have been told that her remedy was worse than the disease; that instead of promising alleviation, it would certainly cause a tenfold aggravation of the complaint; that for every fugitive we now lose we should certainly lose at least ten after disunion on the slave line. Nor is this all. She would have been further told that the effect of placing another Canada upon our immediate border in facilitating the escape of irreclaimable fugitives, would be to create a restless anxiety and continued efforts at escape, such as to render our slaves nearly worthless, and compel their exportation. Thus to remedy the loss of a few, we should suffer the certain loss or deprivation of the whole.

Nor is this unknown to her; she cannot affect to be so ignorant. Hence she allows no consultation about the redress of our peculiar wrongs and insults.

Her late Governor, Gist, had the impudent frankness, in his recent message to her Legislature, to divulge her very disinterested policy upon this subject. Having made up her mind to disunion for the sake of re-opening the African Slave Trade, or for the sake of some other supposed local advantage of her own, or for the sake of vengeance in her gratification of her hate to the Union and the nation, her policy was to precipitate as many of the other Cotton States as she could into disunion also. She was to trust to the assurances of her co-conspirators for the immediate co-operation of some four of them, and to the example of the five for drawing the other Cotton States after them. The co-operation of the border States was neither expected or desirable. For a time, it would be better for the Southern Confederacy for those States to treacherously remain in the Union as a protection to them against the North. But this was to be done under the full conviction that they would thus force upon the border States the unavoidable alternative of "*emancipating their slaves, or joining the Southern Confederacy.*"

This sort of dictation towards such States as Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri, is a modest specimen of the arrogant self-importance of a paltry State with only some three hundred thousand effeminate whites, and four-sevenths of whose whole population are black. She and her colleagues are to form a Southern Confederacy, adopt a Constitution imperatively re-opening the African Slave Trade, or enforcing their cherished theory of free trade, direct taxation, and no tariff, with the full belief that they will coerce the border States to join them, notwithstanding such a Constitution, under the pressure of necessary emancipation as the only

alternative. A paltry State whose contributions to the Government, in the payment of duties and postages, does not near compensate the expense of furnishing her with mails, and a few custom-house and judicial officers, to reach at a single bound such a height of arrogant, dictatorial insolence is beyond all example.

Yet when thus recklessly pursuing her treasonable schemes for her own peculiar local benefit, regardless of the injury she may inflict on others, she modestly expects our sympathy and protection, whilst she is perpetrating her treason, and accomplishing our destruction.

In despite her grossly insulting, dictatorial arrogance, we are expected submissively to place ourselves under the self-assumed guidance of crack-brained fire eaters, who have signalized their statesmanship by rendering ours, according to the admission of one of themselves, "the most corrupt Government in the world;" who have further signalized their capacity by breaking down the most powerful political party we have ever had; who are holding out as among the chief allurements to disunion and benefits of their Southern Confederacy the re-opening of the piratical Slave Trade; a traffic that is denounced as infamous by the Declaration of Independence, and the concurring voice of all Christendom; a traffic so infamous that the nation, with almost perfect unanimity, by her laws, classed it among the most detestable crimes, and awarded it the punishment due to highway robbery and murder. We are expected blindly to confide to such men the making for us of a new confederacy, and new Constitution.

These fire-eating gentry must excuse us. Kentucky acknowledges to no admiration for them, nor to any admiration or special partiality towards South Carolina. She can have no particular sympathy for a State that requires a property qualification for her representatives. A State that submits herself to the government of an aristocracy of nabobs, one of whom proclaimed in the United States Senate the doctrine that "laboring men are everywhere the *mud sills* of society," that "every man is a *slave* who lives by the wages of his labor." Thanks to the patriotic "Working Men of Louisville," who recently poured forth such a heart-warm, indignant protest against disunion, this nabob may now learn that neither they nor their numerous brethren of the great West will ever become the *mud sills* of his impotent fire-eater Confederacy. Thanks, ten thousand thanks are due to those working men for the outpouring of their unadulterated, strong patriotic feelings, which has given to sorrowing, almost desponding hearts, the only glad pulsation that they have known during weary months of gloom. They have shown how Kentuckians will always feel and speak when they assert their manhood, and cast off the fetters of party ties and political leaders. They have shown that there are still real, live Kentuckians among us, worthy of our proud State, and the stock from which they are descended. With aching hearts, listening ears had long been waiting, almost in despair, for the true ring of the right Kentucky metal. It has come, at last, and thanks to the working men of Louisville that it has.

It is true that some of the States, but not so many by nearly one-half as charged by South Carolina, have grossly violated their duty and the Constitution by abortive attempts of their Legislatures to nullify the Fugitive Slave Law. That law may need amendment in some of its details to render it perfectly just, and especially better to guard against its being abused for the purposes of kidnapping. But that affords no justification for those attempts at nullification, which ought to be swept from the statute books of all the States. This the border States have an interest in demanding, and in due time will demand, under the penalty of retaliatory legislation. A slight application of the *lex talionis* by Kentucky would soon compel Ohio to repeal her obnoxious statute. She is the only one of our three near neighbors that has resorted to such statutes. Indiana and Illinois have habitually performed their duty towards us in this particular. A large majority of our recaptured fugitives have been taken by their owners or by the citizens of those States, without the aid of any officers of the law. Many years ago, when the Fugitive Slave Law

was much less efficient than now, Kentucky sent Commissioners to the Ohio Legislature asking a statute to supply the deficiency, and the request was promptly granted. A similar application made now, would, no doubt, result in the repeal of the obnoxious statute. It is true it has never had any effect in preventing the rendition of any fugitive upon which the Federal officers could lay their hands. The statute is treated by every one as a mere nullity, and there has never been a prosecution under it; still it is offensive to Kentucky, tends to create bad feeling between the two states, and ought to be repealed. It was passed during a period of high excitement and resentful feeling, resulting from the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and the maltreatment of Northern men in the management of Kansas affairs. Ohio has had time to cool off, her resentment will be appeased by the admission of Kansas as a free State, and she is now in a mood to listen to our remonstrances, and see and do what is so essential to her own honor, to say nothing of justice to us. No doubt on the application of Maryland and Virginia, for the sake of good neighborhood, Pennsylvania will now do the same. The repeal of the nullifying statutes of Pennsylvania and Ohio would remove most of the Southern discontent against such legislation so far as it is based upon the actual loss of fugitives. After they have passed through those two States the chance of re-capture is so very slight that they are not worth pursuing. The retention of such statutes by the other States would be of no substantial injury to the South, and only serve as degrading mementos of abortive efforts of impotent malice or revenge. This is the right method for settling disputes between the States, but if that fails, we still have adequate remedy in the *retaliatory* legislation recommended by Mr. Calhoun as the true mode of redress against offending States, without a resort to disunion, which should be discarded from every true American's mind as a *remedy for nothing*. Such a remedy is so grievous and costly that sound minds have long settled in the belief that it can never yield adequate compensating benefits. That has always been the doctrine of Kentucky statesmen. The memorable answer of Mr. Clay to the question when he would consent to disunion, was the reiterated "*never, NEVER, NEVER*." Disunion on the slave line carries such obvious and inevitable destructive results to Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri, that no Utopian projector of a Southern Confederacy has ever yet had the ingenuity to suggest even the plausible semblance of any compensating benefit to those three States.

NO. III.—THE SOUTH CAROLINA DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

Why all this loud modern clamor against the attempts of certain States to nullify the Fugitive Slave law? Is an attempt at nullification such a novelty to South Carolina? Some of her Fire-eaters have recently declared, in her Convention, that they had always considered the law unconstitutional, and if so, it cannot be very blameworthy to attempt its nullification. But if otherwise, why has South Carolina never formally protested against those attempts? Why has her delegation never asked Congress to unite with her in such protest? And why has she never resorted to the remedy for such grievances, that retaliatory legislation advised by her great leader, Calhoun? With what decency can she claim such *abortive* attempts at nullification, as sufficient cause for disunion, when her own people, and those of all the other extreme Southern States, have for years been *successfully* nullifying our neutrality laws, and laws against the piratical slave trade, which she and they have practically re-opened? With what greater propriety can she, or those other States, complain of obstructions to the recovery of fugitives by mobs of free negroes and the dregs of Northern States, when she, and those her neighbors, allow mobs, under the countenance of the most respectable members of their society, to habitually insult and maltreat Northern men and deprive them of their constitutional rights? The instances are very numerous where Northern men of respectability, have, without cause, other than that of their Northern residence, been compelled to leave unfinished business and depart from those

States under the threat of lynch law. Some men who have been settled in those States with their families have been compelled so to leave for no cause but their Northern birth, or, perhaps in addition, because when interrogated they would not admit that slavery was a divine institution. How many have been actually murdered for no other cause is a dark secret which will never be fully disclosed. It is suspected that there has been nearly as many of such murders as there has been of owners obstructed in the recovery of fugitives. The instances of the latter are certainly not one in twenty, perhaps not one in fifty, when compared with the instances in which Northern men and women have been causelessly driven from the extreme Southern States, in contempt and despite of the express constitutional guarantee of their right to be there. Yet it is expected that we shall adopt the quarrel of men who thus perpetrate *actual, effective* nullification, and aid them in ruining this great nation and ourselves, because of *attempted* nullification by others.

We had thought, we of the border States had thought, that we had something beside our large interest in slavery that was worthy our care and even our affection. Among these are, our whole country, our whole nation, our several States, the great cause of civil liberty here and elsewhere, now and hereafter, the great cause of Republican confederated Government, the love of peace and odium for civil war, the love for our children and their posterity, the strong desire for national, state, and individual prosperity, all dependent, together with the safety and permanent success of the slave institution itself, upon the preservation of the Union. But even if the slave institution were not thus dependent, we have no reason to deem it so transcendently important as to require us to overlook, or disregard entirely, for its sake, all those other great interests and natural feelings. Still less should it require us to discard all sense of justice, approving indiscriminately everything done in the cause of the slavery propaganda, and censuring everything done by the partisans of free-soilism. We have the right, as it is our duty, impartially to weigh the faults on both sides, and many of us certainly do believe that the present crisis is full as much the fault of the Fire-eater Disunionists as of the Republicans; and on the score of nullification, that the former are more culpable than the latter.

The only other great cause of complaint made by South Carolina is the election of Lincoln. This cause for disunion has been so often discussed, and its insufficiency proved as a thing by itself, that it need not be dwelt upon. But it is alleged that the election of a man of his principles indicated such hostility against slavery as to prove a settled purpose to abolish it. He acknowledges to a strong prejudice against it, that he believes it to be morally, socially, and politically wrong, that it would be all the better for the country if it had never existed; but as it has grown up under the sanction of law, that Congress ought not to interfere with it in the States, even if it had the power, which he distinctly says it has not. He further says that the South is entitled to an efficient fugitive slave law, which it is the duty of the Government to enforce, and if all power over the subject of slavery were given to him, he does not know what he could do with such power for the permanent benefit of either the blacks or whites, and certainly should not exert it for the purposes of immediate emancipation. Now, however objectionable to the South some of these opinions may be, yet it is an undoubted fact that these very same opinions were held by every President we have ever had, unless Jackson, Tyler, Taylor, and Polk be exceptions.

But then it is said, there is his "irrepressible conflict" doctrine, which is a novelty unknown to any of our Presidents. True it is a novelty, and what is much worse, as arrant nonsense as ever fell from the lips of man. It first came from a Virginian, now a member of Congress, of imputed disunion proclivities, and probably uttered in behalf of disunion. Mr. Lincoln adopted the significant phrase, together with the theory it implies, as an argument in favor of free-soil, and Mr. Seward took it from him and became its putative father. But with Mr. Lincoln it is a mere absurd theory of which he proposes no further practical application than as a justification for slavery prohibition in the Territories. The Fire-eater Disunionists raised such a clamor

against the phrase as to make it a most potent bug-bear all through the South. Yet strange to say, no sooner did they cast off their disguise, and avow themselves disunionists, than they adopted the whole theory in its fullest extent, and use it as a main argument in favor of disunion. They now say sure enough there is an irrepressible conflict between free and slave labor, and therefore the Union ought to be dissolved on the slave line. Thus they convert his absurd speculative theory into an indisputable fact, though it is clearly disproved by the nation's long experience of more than a century, and make it the pretext for most tremendous practical action. Free and slave labor have been operating side by side for eighty long years, in adjoining States and in the same State, even closely intermixed in towns and on farms, with a prosperous success.

But they further charge that Lincoln was ridiculous enough to say that a house divided against itself must fall—that the States must become all slave or all free—and as the Northern States wont become slaveholding, and as the house wont fall, slavery is in the process of ultimate extinction. Seward was silly enough to adopt also, this absurd, unstatesmanlike theory; but neither of them proposed to aid the theory, or the verification of their fanciful opinions by any action on the institution within the States, but spoke of it as what was to occur in the remote future, centuries hence, from natural causes alone, such as the irrepressible conflict. The disunionists have also adopted this shallow theory of the divided house. They insist upon it as a certainty that the house must fall—that there is no use in waiting to see whether it is going to fall; and, therefore, they hasten out of it.

They have fully adopted and put into practical use the "higher law" doctrine imputed to Seward in its worse sense. They have succeeded in fastening great odium upon him by inculcating the belief that he meant there was a higher law which would justify him in disregarding the Constitution. They are now doing themselves the very thing, for the supposed desire to do which they heaped such unstinted abuse upon him. They too now avow a higher law, which justifies them not merely in disregarding the constitution, but in breaking it down and trampling it under foot. The right of secession, on which they are acting in their efforts to accomplish our destruction, is their higher law, and of a so much worse type than his, that whereas his only contemplated probable evasion, theirs is to be carried out by actual treason and civil war.

By thus fully adopting the doctrines of the irrepressible conflict, the divided house and the higher law, the disunionists are vindicating Lincoln's pretensions as a true prophet, and dignifying the je-june sciolist vagaries of him and Seward as the teachings of the true philosophy of government.

There can be no truer utterance than that of a resolve of the Democratic legislature of Tennessee, which says: "all the evils of the intense slavery agitation—all the discord, alienation, and bitter hatred between North and South—are the legitimate fruit, not of any necessary conflict between free and slave labor, but of a conflict between rival aspirants for official power and plunder." That great vice of a Republic party feuds, together with the dextrous management of the Disunionists have brought about the present crisis. For party and disunion purposes the slavery question has been agitated until the whole nation has been sectionalized, by playing upon the opposite prejudices of North and South. The chagrin and hate caused by the defeat of the Democratic party, has been a great aid to the Disunionists in precipitating the rebellion with such surprising rapidity. If disunion should come, it will be properly ascribable to the scramble of parties "for official power and plunder," rather than to the irrepressible conflict. Aversion to and apprehension of the Democratic party is one of the main reasons why conciliatory concessions cannot now be obtained from the North. If the Democratic party could be disbanded, there is no doubt that the Republican party would be prostrated before the next Congressional election.

The South Carolina manifesto says that when Lincoln becomes President, "the slaveholding States will no longer have the power of self-government or self-protection." Her apologists also say, more distinctly what she means,

that if not now, the South soon will be unable to protect its slave property against Northern aggression. This, if it were really felt, would be a dastard fear. But they who pretend to feel it are no cowards, and are hypocritically simulating an apprehension not felt. There are no words to express the scorn due to the affectation of such fear as a paltry pretext for disunion. Kentucky lies right in the path of any such aggression, and must be the first to bear the brunt, yet she feels no fear for her property. In the calm self-reliance of proper manhood she scorns all such danger. Her property is amply secured by the Constitution against all approaches of the law, and she cannot conceive of any body of men having the temerity to cross her border without law, to rob her of her property. She has the most undoubting confidence in her ability to protect herself against such lawless violence. Even supposing that most improbable event that the Federal Government should become active participants in such an aggression against the South, are not her eight millions of people competent to their self protection within the Union against so inefficient a government? If not, how can they protect themselves against the North when it becomes a hostile, separte nation; how protect herself against any other powerful nation? Within the Union we should always have a divided North to resist, whilst out of the Union the united strength of the whole North would be arrayed against us. No Kentuckian would abate a single dollar in the price of his slaves on account of any such danger. The fear ought to be still less, if possible, farther South than with us. There is really no such fear felt, it is all pretence, gotten up as a pretext for disunion. What a slender inducement do they afford us to join a Southern Confederacy, when thus avowing its incompetency to self-protection.

Though the eight millions are superabundantly able to protect themselves within the Union, yet their ability to properly protect themselves out of it against the eighteen millions who will be made inveterate enemies by the very act of separation, may well be doubted. By a very probable union with the British possessions, the North would at once become the owner of the largest commercial marine in the world, and upon that basis could soon create a naval marine equal to that of England. With a hardy, enterprising population of more than twenty millions, and with such a navy, or even the tenth of it, how could our eight millions cope with them; how, indeed, even without such a junction with the British colonies? With our ports blockaded, our whole commerce stopped, our agricultural products left to rot on our hands, the sinews of war dried up among us, we could be coerced into an ignominious submission without even an invasion of our long line of undefendable inland border. If we wanted the consolation to be derived from the glory of well stricken fields of battle, we should have to incur all the disadvantage of being ourselves the invaders. The South would exhibit the impetuous valor of the French, but it would be met by the stubborn courage of the English. The ultimate victory would be on the side of the greater numbers and the largest purse, aided by the only naval force. Though only little more than double our numbers, the North would have more than quadruple our military strength. Yet we are seriously asked to give up our present prosperous condition, our present position of perfect security in the very center of a powerful nation, to join an imbecile confederacy that must forever remain in a condition of degrading, mortifying inferiority to its more powerful neighbor. And all for what? For the shallowest, flimsiest pretexts that ever were urged for severing a great prosperous nation into two hostile parts.

Aye, but the Republicans threaten that if they ever get the power slavery shall be excluded from the Territories, and though the laws of climate and trade have inexorably proclaimed the exclusion without any aid from Republicans, still the threat is an insult to the South, and Southern honor cannot brook an insult—we must dissolve the Union for revenge. If this be insult or injury, it is one which the South patiently and prosperously endured for sixty-four years, and in the instance of the Missouri Compromise it was inflicted by the procurement of nearly all the eminent men of the South. For this the Government of this great nation must be broken up, and the vast

commercial and political interests of the South thrown into irretrievable ruin. This may be Fire-eater chivalry, but with other people it will pass under a less polite designation. Kentucky will never put herself under the guidance of men who advise the cutting of her own throat to revenge an insult actually given; still less will she follow the guidance of those who would advise a man to blow out his own brains to avoid an insult or an injury which is only threatened. This insult and Southern honor doctrine, if it is accompanied with a particle of practical sense, must mean to dissolve the Union for the purpose of enabling the South to declare war against the North; for otherwise the honor will be lost, and the insult unavenged, just as much as if the South remains in the Union. Let the proposition, then, be stated in plain terms—the South secedes that she may go to war with the North.

NO. IV. — A MISSISSIPPI VALLEY CONFEDERACY.

When a sensible people break up an old Government for the purpose of forming a new one, among the most important subjects for consideration will be the probable stability of the proposed new Government. To pull down an existing Government, even when bad, is an achievement of comparatively little merit; but to erect upon its ruins a stable, good Government, is the very highest achievement of human wisdom. It is for such an achievement that our fathers have, heretofore, stood as the exemplars of the world, and received its admiration and applause. Let us then inquire into the probable stability of a Confederacy of all the Southern States. As to that rickety concern, a Cotton State Confederacy, its probable duration is not worth talking about. Its durability and prosperity would be just what ought to be expected from fire-eater wisdom.

A Southern Confederacy would commence its career with a dower of hate among its citizens towards each other, which has seldom prevailed in a nation without bringing civil war. This might not, and probably would not be the result in this instance, because they could and would be avoided by the milder modern process of secession. The hate which the Union men would bear to those who had dragged them into the Confederacy, would be just what the Fire-eater now bears the Abolitionist. Hate begets hate, and Fire-eaters would reciprocate the feeling most cordially. There would be no great interest of reciprocated benefits, such as that now subsisting between the North and the South, to silence and overcome such feelings. The Eastern and Western Cotton States would be mere rivals and competitors in the same branch of business without any commercial intercommunication. The two cities of Charleston and New Orleans, who are the promised recipients of nearly all the anticipated benefits, would start as rivals, and make the effects of their rivalry felt before the Confederacy was even clothed with its new harness. The small amount of trade that would ever reach Charleston from Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri, would be a constant bone of contention between them. Louisiana would soon agitate, and successfully agitate for a South-Western Confederacy. The thing certainly would not last through the first vigorously contested Presidential election between an Eastern and a Western candidate. There would be nothing to keep it together, no love of country, no mutual pride in a powerful, prosperous country, no bright memories to stimulate a national feeling, but in lieu thereof the enduring hate of those Union-loving men who had suffered under the violation of all the patriotic feelings they ever knew, or wish to know, and the rending assunder the strongest ligaments of the human heart. Even the fact of slaveholding, though so violent an incentive to jealous sectional passion, and the main cause of the Confederacy, would do little to keep it together, because it would cease to be even a peculiarity where all would be slaveholders. Its disadvantageous comparison with its more prosperous neighbor, its proven incapacity to take rank among the more respectable nations, together with the disappointment of all those golden dreams with which we were seduced into disunion, would make its citizens contemplate the Confederacy with contempt and

loathing. The smallest amount of sectional jealousy, of conflicting sectional interest would at once rend it into two parts. How many other sub-divisions it would ultimately fall into it is needless to speculate.

Gloomy as the prospect is, we must make up our minds to the stern fact, that in less than ninety days eight Cotton States will have agreed to unite in another Confederacy, and the chances are that during the present year, Virginia and North Carolina may join them. The question then will be up for consideration by our three border States, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri, what shall they do? The question is already agitating all their citizens in every neighborhood. Neighbor and neighbor, friend and friend, brother and brother, and even father and son, are already quarreling over it. They are doing this upon a false issue. They are quarreling as if the only alternative for these three States was to remain in the Union, or join the South. This is a great error. Such is not our only alternative. We have a choice vastly better for us than either of those in such a contingency. It is to aid in forming a *Mississippi Valley Confederacy*.

As a relief to the manual labor of composition to an old man, he will reproduce here what he wrote on this subject two years ago, and published in a series of letters addressed to Hon. J. J. Crittenden:

In answer to a claim made on you, Mr. Crittenden, as a Southern man, to aid the South in perpetrating the Lecompton iniquity, you properly said you could not be influenced by such consideration; but, even if you could, that the South had no such claim on you; that Kentuckians were neither Northern or Southern, but were *Western* people. You reminded them that there was such a section of our country as the great valley of the Mississippi, that Kentucky was in the center of that valley, and that, if she belonged to any section, the whole of that valley was her section. In so acting and in so urging, you have earned the thanks of every Kentuckian. It was time that the politicians should be informed of these facts; and that, in their treasonable machination for splitting up our country into separate confederacies, they must bear in mind that our great valley, our section, is one and indivisible.

An eminent Democratic Senator from South Carolina, in projecting, in debate, a Southern confederacy, seemed to have remembered our valley, and to have had some appreciation of its value. In setting forth the magnitude and importance of his proposed Southern confederacy, he very complacently appropriated the whole valley as a mere *appanage* of the more Southern cotton-growing States. The extreme modesty and reasonableness of this appropriation will be apparent when we recollect that those States are only nine in number, with a white population of not more than three million,—whilst the great valley, with its appendages, Michigan and Texas, already contains fourteen States, with a large portion of two others, and a white population of more than eleven millions. Leaving out its four cotton States, the valley contains a white population of more than ten millions. Counting only the settled portion of its territory, excluding all but a third of Texas, and going no further west than Kansas, the valley contains double as much territory as all the States east of it. When its population is only half as dense as that of Kentucky, or one-tenth that of Massachusetts, it will contain a population of one hundred million. If the rate of increase indicated by the last two decades of the census is kept up, it will, in the short space of ten years, have fifteen millions of whites. If not so now, it is the predetermined seat of American empire. In less than ten years its absolute sway as mistress of American power will be uncontrollable and indestructible.

The diversity of climate in the valley, and of agricultural, commercial, and industrial pursuits among its people, serves to produce a homogeneity of commercial interest; whilst its geographical position compels it into unity as the common home of one, and only one, people. A most prosperous home it has been. It has increased in population and wealth with a rapidity never paralleled in the history of the world. Unmixed prosperity reigns throughout its wide bound. Its march is onward, rapidly onward, to still greater strength, wealth, and prosperity. It knows no stagnation any where. It is rearing a hardy, industrious, vigorous race of free-men, such as the world never saw. It honors, encourages, and rewards all honest labor, whilst it scorns the sluggard.

This is the mighty home of ours which this modest Carolinian would appropriate as a mere appanage to his nine cotton States, with their three millions of whites, in the formation of his proposed Southern confederacy. States, one-third of whom are laboring under a lethargic paralysis, like that of their worn-out, poor land; who dishonor and decry manual labor among whites, and sent senators to Congress

to denounce all white men as slaves "who live by the wages of their labor;" States that have not sufficient mechanical skill and industry to manufacture their own plows and axes, nor their hats and shoes; States who know no manual industry but that of the slave, and the bulk of whose population that have not made their escape to richer lands are sluggishly attenuating a languid, sluggish existence under the enervating influence of their climate. The least arrogant shape in which the Senator's idea can be presented is, that our ten States, with their ten millions of whites, will permit their future destiny to be controlled and dictated to them by those nine States and their three millions of white. The impudence of the assumption is on a par with the iniquity of the scheme.

Land-locked though we are, our prosperity, like that of every other portion of the Union, depends upon our access to foreign markets. Let us shape this proposed Southern confederacy, and then see what it promises us by way of outlet and protection to our commerce on the ocean. To avoid a mere geographical line of separation, and for other obvious reasons, Maryland and Delaware would be compelled to go with the North. The Carolina Senator does not seem to expect, with any confidence, that the free States of our valley will join his Southern confederacy. We know certainly that they would not. To say nothing of their prejudices, their commercial interests preponderate decidedly the other way. The Potomac and the Chesapeake would be the northeastern, whilst the Ohio, Iowa, and Kansas would be the northwestern boundary of the Southern confederacy. The whole Atlantic and Gulf coast, from the Chesapeake to Mexico, has Norfolk for its only commercial harbor that can float a frigate. The States bordering that long line of coast have comparatively very little shipping, and no means of creating either a commercial or naval marine. The most paltry naval power, Spain, Portugal, or even Denmark, could blockade all our ports, and prevent our access to the ocean. The little ocean commerce of our own that we should have would be the prey of pirates. We should have to buy a transit for our commerce from the Northern confederacy, or, as has been recently suggested by a South Carolina paper, ignominiously place ourselves under the protection of some foreign power, and hire its aid to relieve us from the blockade. What a nation this would be! What a proud, prosperous confederacy the scheme promises us!

The scheme is that Kentucky and Missouri shall give up their enviable central position in the very heart of a great, prosperous nation, and become the mere frontier appendages of an impotent confederacy, and prevent, if we can, the Northern hordes from invading its Southern climes. Suppose the separation to have taken place, and the inevitable war with the Northern confederacy to have ensued, what aid would Kentucky and Missouri receive from South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama in protecting our long line of indefensible frontier? An old Kentuckian answered the question by saying, they would offer us any number of gentlemen with epaulets, but not a single man with knapsack and musket.

Why are Kentucky and Missouri to adopt such a position as that, in lieu of their present one of absolute security against foreign invasion, with free access to the ocean at the North and the South, and a powerful nation to protect their access to foreign markets? What is the compensating benefit? There is none, in fact, nor do the disunionists even pretend that there is. All that we are to achieve is to get rid of associating, under the same government, with the Northern people, who do not admire negro slavery, and have the ill manners or the impudence to tell us so. This is the whole grievance from which we are suffering, and which would be remedied by a separation. Wrong to us, or aggression upon our rights as slaveholders by the Federal Government, there has been none, absolutely none.

Aye, there are those among us, the tools of party, who have had the impudence to upbraid us with imputed want of proper sectional sympathy, that we will not blindfolded aid these bad men in hastening our perdition. Let it be known by these revilers, and all others, from this time forth, that the people of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri owe no fealty to any section which is not in strict subordination to the higher, nobler, worthier fealty which they owe to their country, their whole country—that is, to the Union. But if there is any section, above all others, to which they are bound in close sympathy by the ties of affection and permanent interest, it is their own section—that of which they are the heart and center, the great Valley of the Mississippi. When that section calls for disunion, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri, will respectfully give ear to the reasons for such a national calamity,—for calamity it certainly will be, come when and how it may. Till then, till that sad day comes, Kentuckians, Tennesseans, and Missourians will listen to no counsels, make no combinations touching the Union, except from and with their brethren of the valley,—and that, too, only for its preservation and its security.

What complaint have we of this valley to make of our country or our position? When did such rapid growth in wealth and numbers,—such peace, plenty, happiness, and prosperity, individual and collective, ever attend the career of any other people? All history affords no parallel. Of all the regular pursuits of industry

among us, which have most certainly and most rapidly yielded large fortunes, cotton-growing stands pre-eminent. Yet, strange to say, it is among the cotton-growers of three of the States of our valley that alone is to be found, anywhere throughout the valley, the least taint of disloyalty to the Union. They amongst us who have been most benefited by the Union, they who have most prospered under it, they who are most dependent upon its great, undivided strength for the safe, continuous export of their great staple, they are its only revilers. Nineteen-twentieths, aye, ninety-nine hundredths of their Northern brethren of this great valley cry shame upon them, not merely for disloyalty to our section, but for the far worse disloyalty to our common mother, to our great, prosperous, glorious, all-lovable country.

Can it be that any portion of these men are blinded with the foolish belief that the Delta of the Mississippi, that great key to the commerce of our valley, belongs to the people of Mississippi and Louisiana, and that they can so use it as to coerce our submission to their suicidal projects? Surely they cannot be sane, if any there be who so think. They are the occupants, not the proprietors. The proprietorship is with the whole eleven millions of whites who occupy the great valley. To assert a separate, exclusive proprietorship in themselves would be as wise as to attempt to stop the flow of the great Father of Rivers. Any puny effort, with such an object, would not be more futile than an attempt by them to resist that Northern human torrent which will certainly pour upon them whenever it becomes necessary to prove the true ownership and masterdom of the Delta.

All sectional conventions are more or less impolitic, whatever may be their object. They tend to engender sectionalism, the great bane of our country. The people of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri have sedulously abstained from them with the most laudable pertinacity. But when so many secret and indirect, overt and direct efforts are constantly being made to foment jealousies, ill-will, and disaffection among the people of our valley—in fact, to separate us upon the slave-line, which runs straight through the center of the valley—shall nothing be done to counteract these machinations, nothing to evoke an expression of popular sentiment in their condemnation? Whilst such efforts are making to pull us to pieces, whilst to that end unscrupulous use is made of that vile but powerful lever, party feeling, and of that still viler and more powerful agent, sectional feeling, shall nothing be done to revive and keep alive and pure that old-fashioned national feeling and patriotism that have made us what we are? Whilst insidious enemies are doing all they can to pull us asunder, shall we do nothing towards hugging closer and more firmly together? This thing has been too long neglected; it has been too long left to political parties to play upon our passions and prejudices for their selfish party ends. The occasion is worthy of a great stir and political revival among the whole people of the valley. Either through legislative resolves, or the action of primary assemblies, something should be done to manifest the fixed, almost unanimous resolve of the people of this great valley to continue together and remain forever one and indivisible. Let that mighty word be once spoken; let all the people of the valley, with comparative unanimity, confirm the fiat of nature, and pronounce our valley one and indivisible, and you strengthen, if you do not virtually re-establish, the foundation of our Government. Whilst the valley hangs together, our commerce will forever bind to us, in willing bonds, all the people between the Hudson and the Potomac; and our commerce, as one power, will equally bind to us, in willing or unwilling bonds, the States of the lower Mississippi. The narrow strip lying south of the Potomac and east of the valley, would be too insignificant, as to population and national resources, ever to desire to become a separate confederacy, even if a rational motive could be conjectured for desiring separation upon such a geographical basis as that. If our valley remains firmly united, no human ingenuity can devise a line of probable separation. It may even be affirmed that, so long as our valley continues united, *the Union will be indestructible.*

It is time that the suggestions of this letter should be seriously considered by the people of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri, and that they were doing whatever may be necessary to prevent our great Valley from being divided. An eminent French traveler of great ability, and of unrivaled reputation as judicious commentator upon our political institutions, has said that our Valley is "*the most magnificent home that God has anywhere provided for man.*" The enlightened Senator Hammond, of South Carolina, in the speech before alluded to, said: "The great valley of the Mississippi, now the real and soon to be the acknowledged seat of the empire of the world." "There is the great Mississippi, a bond of union made by nature herself. She will maintain it forever." Let us follow the guidance of nature in framing a new Confederacy, and trust to her persuasive, flattering promise that she will main-

tain its Union forever. If we can preserve our magnificent home in its entirety at the present juncture, we may well hope that the strengthening influence of natural causes will preserve it unbroken forever.

To this end the Legislatures of our three border States should immediately recommend such a Confederacy, in case the eight Cotton States shall actually resolve on secession, as a better alternative for them than either remaining in the Union or joining a Confederacy of the Slave States. In that contingency, and with a view to a Valley Confederacy, recommend all the States of the Valley to meet in Convention and adopt a Constitution for the new Union. If started at once, this can be accomplished by the time that the other border Slave States will be ready for final action.

As to the success of such a plan there can be no reasonable doubt. The States north of the Ohio have the same repugnance to disunion on the slave line that we have. In the necessary avoidance of such a disaster, they will cheerfully give all reasonable guarantees in the new Constitution on the slavery question. They will be apt to concede everything Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri will ask as reasonable and necessary to the harmony of the new Confederacy. The Convention would be composed of an equal number of slave and free States, fourteen in all; or if Michigan and Texas be left out as not properly belonging to the Valley, then there would be twelve States. Or what would be better, take Kansas into the Convention, though not yet a State, thereby giving the free States the preponderance in number which they must ultimately possess, and thereby affording better earnest that the guarantees will be faithfully adhered to.

This plan obviates two main difficulties in obtaining Northern concession towards conciliation. The political power of the North, both in Congress and the Legislatures, is in the hands of the Republican party. That party was created for the purpose of overthrowing the Democratic party, and party leaders will never concede, voluntarily, what tends to the defeat of their own party, and the re-elevation of their hated and defeated adversaries. The other and the main difficulty is, that concession made now would look as if the North was succumbing to Southern bravado and threats. This sort of submission it has definitely made up its mind against, whatever may be the penalty. It is, therefore, useless to look to Congressional compromises for getting us out of our danger. Without the most ample cooling time, which the Cotton States have not the slightest intention of yielding, the present temper of feeling at the North will cause the rejection of any compromise. In forming a Valley Union on the basis of a proper Compromise, neither of these difficulties would occur. Its formation would not necessarily invoke the resuscitation of the Democratic party in the new Union, and the needful concessions would not be made under the threats, but yielded to the friendly solicitation of the slave States of the Valley.

It is true that much the larger amount of the trade of the North-West tends to the East, and not to the South, and if weighed in merely commercial scales the question of connection, as between the two, would preponderate in favor of the East. But that is not so. The question of peace or warfare in the Valley, are involved in the decision. It has heretofore been the almost undivided opinion of our statesmen and considerate men of every grade whose opinions are at all worth quoting, that disunion on the slave line carries with it, as a necessary incident, immediate, protracted warfare, all through the Valley. On the contrary, division of the North-West from the East involves no such horrible evil as a necessary consequence. The commercial instincts and good sense can well be relied on to preserve the most amicable relations with the Valley. The sagacity of our neighbors across the Ohio will show them that the commercial interests of the East can be safely relied on for much more than that. The Valley Confederacy once formed, there would be a competition of alacrity of all between the Hudson and the Potomac in seeking admission into our new Union. Western Virginia would be certain to join us, and the fear of severance on the Blue Ridge would compel all Virginia to do so.

Should Louisiana and Mississippi obstinately refuse to take part in the proposed Convention, though much to be regretted, yet their refusal would be no



3 0112 098215830

serious obstruction to a new Union embracing the entire Valley. The Confederacy once formed under the authority of the ten or eleven millions of whites inhabiting the upper part of the Valley, the six hundred thousand whites of Louisiana and Mississippi would never be insane enough to offer resistance, but if they did, it would be quite easy to make them know to whom the Valley and its great river belong. In the choice between the attitudes of associated States and subjugated Provinces they would never hesitate.

After the North and East have joined us, the Atlantic Cotton States would not long delay to do the same. Then the necessary compromise amendments of the Constitution can be obtained, without either section seemingly yielding to the other, without even supposed loss of honor or pride to either. Thus and thus only can the good ship receive a needful, durable repair, and without the loss of a single plank again move forward majestically on her hopeful voyage to a gloriously immortal destiny. But should this brilliant result not be entirely attained, still our three border slave States will accomplish a new Confederacy, without bloodshed, far better for all their vital permanent interests than any other that can be carved out of the dissevered Union.

This is the last hope for Kentucky to avoid that utter ruin which her statesmen have uniformly prognosticated as the inevitable result of disunion upon the slave line; a ruin that would equally fall upon Missouri, and in a great though lesser degree, upon Tennessee also.